

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/606,909	06/26/2003	Michael E. Leckrone	P-8030.03	5688	
27581	7590 01/19/20	01/19/2006		EXAMINER	
MEDTRON	•		HO, UYEN T		
710 MEDTRONIC PARK MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-9924		ļ	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3731		
			DATE MAILED: 01/19/200	DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6	

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/606,909	LECKRONE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ZAGIIIIIOI	7.11.01111				
	(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho	3731				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expiresmonths from the maining date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee leave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
NOTICE OF APPEAL	liana with 27 OFD 44 27 much ha	filed within two meants				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since			
AMENDMENTS						
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
	Claim(s) objected to: <u>39,41 and 43-45</u> .					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>40</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
D. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	' '	A A			
10. 23 Other. <u>366 Ochandation Silvet</u> .		Janyeil	lele			
		(Jackie) Tan-Uyen Patent Examiner Art Unit: 3731	T. Ho			

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claims 39, 41, 43-45 anticipated by cited references in the previous office action.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues that the rejection of claims having the stabilizing means limitations based on Vacho is in error in that it fails to apply a proper analysis under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 6, for means-plus-function claim limitations. Although, applicant elected species directed to embodiment of Figs. 9-13, the claimed limitation "means for stabilizing" is generic to all species and Vacho disclose the stabilizing means having structure equivalent to embodiment shown in figure 32 of the application.